DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 295 HE 010 887

TITLE Equal Educational Opportunity in California Postsecondary Education. Part I. Commission Report 76-6.
INSTITUTION California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.
PUB DATE Apr 76
NOTE 26p.; Appendices not included due to marginal legibility

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; *Affirmative Action; College Admission; College Integration; Educational Discrimination; *Equal Education; *Females; Higher Education; *Minority Groups; Nondiscriminatory Education; *Postsecondary Education; Program Development; Racial Composition; Racial Discrimination; School Demography; Sex Discrimination; *State Action; State Legislation

ABSTRACT

California's progress towards the equitable participation of ethnic minorities and women in the admission and retention of postsecondary education students is reported. Part 1 provides a background and summary of the California student affirmative action program. Part 2 describes student body composition (ethnic and sexual) and part 3 considers the development of comparison bases for universities and colleges. Part 4 describes California Community Colleges' response to the affirmative action program, part 5 reviews a report submitted by California State Universities and Colleges, and part 6 describes the progress made toward the development of a comprehensive plan for student affirmative action by the University of California. Part 7 describes five obstacles to equal educational opportunity and presents recommendations for achieving this goal. Appended are the following documents: Assembly Concurrent Resolution 151; tables and charts; reports by California Community Colleges, California State Universities and Colleges, and the University of California in response to the Assembly Concurrent Resolution 151; and A Report to the President of the University of California from the Student Affirmative Action Task Groups. (BD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED175295

Commission Report 76-6
April 1976

EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY IN CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION: PART I

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Calif. PSE Commission

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 010 887

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Report

Prepared by the

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY	1
II.	STUDENT BODY COMPOSITION	4
III.	COMPARISON BASE	7
IV.	CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES	9
V.	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES	11
VI.	UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA	14
VII.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	17

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

PREFACE

One of the priority goals of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is to "work toward the equitable participation of ethnic minorities and women in the admission and retention of postsecondary education students." This goal can be realized only through the coordinated efforts of the public segments of postsecondary education. The Commission will play a leadership role in achieving the cooperation needed to make equal educational opportunity a reality in California.

Appreciation is expressed to Bruce D. Hamlett and Melvyn C. Jarrett, II of the Commission's staff for their work in developing Part I of this report. We invite others to work with us during the coming months as we seek to establish an effective statewide intersegmental plan for student affirmative action.

Donald R. McNeil
Director

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge the contributions of several people who assisted in the development of this report. Dr. Phillip Paris, Northwest Regional Education Laboratory, made important contributions in preparing the initial draft. Ms. Kati Haycock, University of California; Dean Robert Bess, California State University and Colleges; Ms. Lilliam C. Morales, California Community Colleges; and Mr. Bruce Fuller, Consultant, Assembly Permanent Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, all furnished constructive criticism in the preparation of the final draft. Appreciation is also expressed to Judy Truskett and Betty Brown of the staff for their continuing contribution to this project.

I. BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY

Equal educational opportunity for all California citizens has been a goal of our public institutions since at least 1965. In the past ten years, considerable progress has been made toward this goal, as minority enrollments have approximately doubled as a percentage of the total student body.

During the same period, the financial commitment to achieving equality of educational opportunity also has increased. The Board of Regents, for example, has contributed $40 million from its own resources for the University of California's Educational Opportunity Program. The California State University and Colleges will expend over $6 million in State funds in the current year for its Educational Opportunity Program. The California Community Colleges have an Extended Opportunity Programs and Services program (EOPS) of equivalent size. Despite these significant efforts, however, equal educational opportunity remains a goal and not a reality in California postsecondary education.

Recognizing the need for increased efforts by public institutions to overcome the underrepresentation of women, ethnic minorities, and low-income persons in their student bodies, the Legislature adopted Assembly Concurrent Resolution 151 (1974). This resolution requested the Regents of the University of California, the Trustees of the California State University and Colleges, and the Governors of the California Community Colleges:

> To prepare a plan that will provide for addressing and overcoming, by 1980, ethnic, economic, and sexual underrepresentation in the make-up of the student bodies of institutions of public higher education as compared to the general ethnic, economic, and sexual composition of recent California high school graduates.

These plans were to be submitted to the California Postsecondary Education Commission by July 1, 1975, and the Commission in turn was to "integrate and transmit the plans to the Legislature with its comments."

In addition, ACR 151 requested the three public segments to report annually to the Commission on their progress toward the 1980 goal, with specific discussion of obstacles to the implementation of a statewide plan. These reports are to be integrated and transmitted to the Legislature by the Commission, together with its evaluations and recommendations.

The Legislature also identified four methods for responding to the problem of underrepresentation:

(a) affirmative efforts to search out and contact qualified students;

(b) experimentation to discover alternative means of evaluating student potential;

(c) augmented student financial assistance programs; and

(d) improved counseling for disadvantaged students.

An analysis of the segmental reports submitted to the Commission in response to ACR 151 leads to the following conclusions:

- The reports are not adequate in meeting the Legislative request that the segments develop a coherent plan to address and overcome the problem of underrepresentation. While the reports vary considerably in the degree of specific and comprehensive analysis presented, none reveals a thoroughly developed, detailed plan for student affirmative action.

- Compared to the composition of recent California high school graduates, Black and Spanish-surnamed students are underrepresented in public postsecondary education. Moreover, during the past two years, the degree of underrepresentation apparently has increased rather than decreased. While women are also underrepresented, this occurs more frequently in the graduate programs.

- While increased financial assistance through the several student aid programs is probably needed, greater emphasis must be placed on (1) recruitment programs to increase the eligibility pool of the underrepresented groups, and (2) on student support services to promote successful educational experiences for those who gain access to public postsecondary education.

- Efforts by the segments to achieve the goal of equal educational opportunity would be enhanced by a clearer long-range commitment on the part of the Legislature and the Governor to support a coherent financial program requisite for an effective student affirmative action plan. While ACR 151 states "it is the intent of the Legislature to commit the resources to implement this

policy," State government as a whole has not demonstrated this intent.

Given these conclusions, it is clear that the institutions of public postsecondary education are only in the beginning stage of developing a student affirmative action program. Accordingly, this report should be considered the first of two dealing with equal educational opportunity in postsecondary education. This first report describes the current situation in the student affirmative action programs of the public segments and presents initial recommendations and guidelines for the development of a comprehensive statewide plan for student affirmative action. The second report, to be developed through cooperative efforts by the Commission and the three public segments, will present this statewide plan and will include a detailed discussion of the activities and costs of current and proposed programs. The Commission can and should play a leadership role in developing a statewide plan coordinating segmental activities. The second report will be submitted to the Legislature in January 1977.

II. STUDENT BODY COMPOSITION

Meaningful analysis and conclusions concerning segmental progress in student affirmative action are hindered by the lack of consistent and uniform data on the ethnic composition of segmental student bodies. As examples, the following should be noted: (1) ethnic classifications and definitions have changed from year to year; (2) there has been considerable variety in the methods used by the segments to collect data during the past three years; (3) the University of California provided only percentage figures on the composition of its student body; (4) neither the University nor the State University and Colleges provided data concerning the part-time/full-time status of students; and (5) some Community College campuses did not submit data for the system-wide report.

To alleviate these problems, it will be necessary for the segments to adopt a common format for reporting data. Commission and segmental staffs should begin immediately to develop this format, using as a basis for discussion the proposed "Segmental Reporting Form on Student Affirmative Action" included in Appendix B.

Using the ethnic and sexual composition of recent California high school graduates as a basis for comparison, four generalizations can be made concerning progress toward the goal of equal educational opportunity. These generalizations are based on information provided by the segments and summarized on Tables 2 and 3 in Appendix B.

1. Spanish-surnamed students are significantly underrepresented in all three public segments. The representation of Spanish-surnamed women students is particularly low. (Chart 4)

2. Black students are underrepresented in both the California State University and Colleges and the University of California. (Chart 3)

3. The degree of underrepresentation of Black and Spanish-surnamed students in the three public segments apparently has increased in the past two years.[1] (Tables 1 and 2)

---

1. In A Report to the President of the University of California From the Student Affirmative Action Task Groups, it is stated that "there is no reason to believe that by 1980 parity on the basis of ethnic, sexual, and economic characteristics will be achieved under current recruitment practices since there has been minimal improvement in Student Affirmative Action during the first half of this decade. In fact, 1974 enrollment data indicates a decrease in University attendance among several Affirmative Action Student Groups." (Page 106) This report is dated July 1975.

4. Women students are underrepresented in all three public segments. The representation of women graduate students in the University of California is particularly low. (Table 3)

Although ACR 151 calls for the segments to address and overcome economic underrepresentation in the make-up of their student bodies, none of the segmental reports provided information in this area. This reflects the absence of economic data about either recent high school graduates or students in postsecondary education. While studies currently underway should provide more information,[2] there presently is no basis for making generalizations regarding the degree of economic underrepresentation on a statewide basis.

A source of potentially important information regarding the economic background of students is the recent report of the Assembly Permanent Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education.[3] Although based on a limited sample of students in the Los Angeles area, this report suggests some patterns in the postsecondary educational activities of recent high school graduates.

1. When compared with students in the Community Colleges and State University and Colleges, those at the University tend to be from high- and middle-income families.

2. When compared with students from high- and middle-income families, those from low-income families are more likely to attend a Community College.

3. The independent colleges and universities in the survey appear to be more effective than the public

---

2. The studies of particular importance are the 1975-76 Student Resources Survey and the University of California expanded eligibility survey.

3. Unequal Access to College: Postsecondary Opportunities and Choices of High School Graduates, a staff report, Assembly Permanent Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, California Legislature, November 1975. This report was based on a sample of 1,592 respondents to a survey from 20 Los Angeles high schools. The survey was conducted in May 1974.

four-year institutions in providing educational opportunity for low-income students.[4]

4. "Substantial inequality of post-high school opportunities exists between graduates of high schools serving low-income areas and graduates of high schools serving high-income areas."[5]

While these generalizations apply only to a limited geographic area, they are potentially important in that the methods being used by some independent institutions are apparently more successful in recruiting low-income students. The public institutions should study these methods in developing their student affirmative action programs. In addition, the study clearly describes the problem of unequal access and indicates the areas in which more information and more effort are needed to overcome economic underrepresentation.

---

4. "There seems to be surprising equality of opportunity for graduates choosing to enter a private college or university: Private college entrance rates for graduates from high-, middle-, and low-income schools are roughly equal at ten, seven, and eight percent." Ibid., page 17.

   This generalization, which relates only to the Los Angeles area surveyed is contradicted by 1972 Student Resource Survey data, which indicated that the University of California enrolled a larger percentage of severely low-income students than did the independent institutions, as well as a smaller percentage of extremely high-income students.

5. Ibid., page 2.

III. COMPARISON BASE

Each of the segmental reports argues against the use of "the general ethnic, economic, and sexual composition of recent California high school graduates" as the basis for determining underrepresentation. While one can agree that there are weaknesses in using recent high school graduates as a basis for comparison, Commission staff has made the following assumptions and judgments:

1. Extended discussion about the type of comparison base is not productive; it directs attention away from the fact that women, Blacks, Spanish-surnamed, and low-income students are underrepresented in California postsecondary education, regardless of which comparison base is used. While the Legislature suggested using recent high school graduates, comparison could also be made with the adult population, the 1970 census, and/or California's K-12 population. However, the specific method used affects only the degree of underrepresentation; it does not alter the fact of underrepresentation;

2. The function of the comparison base is to provide an indicator of segmental progress toward the goal of equal educational opportunity. It is not to be regarded as a quota in that it does not prescribe a final number or percentage of students of a specific ethnic background; and

3. Black and Spanish-surnamed population, as a percentage of the total California population, will increase between 1975 and 1980. Within five years, almost one-third of California's population will consist of ethnic minorities. Given this changing ethnic composition, increasing numbers of Blacks and Spanish-surnamed students, as well as women in all ethnic groups, ought to be recruited into California postsecondary education. If this does not occur, the degree of underrepresentation inevitably will increase.

Because each segment has a different educational mission, it appears that no single comparison base is suitable for all three segments. Accordingly, in future reports each segment should use a comparison base appropriate to its specific mission and geographical location. For example, the Community Colleges should evaluate the progress of each campus on the basis of the ethnic, economic, and sexual composition of the adult population in the district. The Community Colleges, as a system, should be evaluated in terms of the statewide

adult population. This approach will reflect the special characteristics of each local district, as well as the fact that the Community Colleges obtain their students from the entire adult population rather than primarily from recent high school graduates.

Developing comparison bases for the University and the State University and Colleges presents a more difficult task, since their potential students are drawn from the upper 12-1/2 and 33-1/3 percent, respectively, of high school graduates. In preparing Part II of this report, Commission staff will work with the segments in developing a more refined method of comparison, which will reflect an understanding of the size of the pool of those eligible for admission in each segment.

IV. CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A review of the Community Colleges' response to ACR 151 reveals the following significant points:

1. Compared to the general ethnic composition of recent California high school graduates, Blacks, Asians, and American Indians are adequately represented in the student bodies of the Community Colleges. Spanish-surnamed students, particularly women, are underrepresented. (See Table 2.)

2. There apparently has been a 2 or 3 percent decline in the proportion of ethnic minorities in the California Community Colleges, when Fall 1974 enrollments are compared with those of Fall 1973. (See Tables 1 and 2.)

3. While the Community Colleges' report asserted a growing resistance among students to furnishing personal information, there was no indication as to the size of the "no response" group. This lack of information raises serious questions about the accuracy of the ethnic and sexual enrollment data.

4. The report does not include a comprehensive plan for addressing and overcoming, by 1980, the ethnic, sexual, and economic underrepresentation in Community College student bodies. Rather, the report is a compilation of district responses regarding the existence of locally developed plans. Of the 70 districts surveyed, 32 did not respond, 19 indicated they currently meet the requirements of ACR 151, and 7 indicated they partially meet the requirements of ACR 151. The remaining 12 districts indicated they would be able to meet the requirements of ACR 151 by 1980.

   Since April 1969, the Board of Governors has had guidelines for an affirmative action policy and plan, which have been suggested to local districts. In an April 1975 report to the Board concerning the number of local districts which have adopted these guidelines, only four had no policies and only one had no plan. However, the substance of district policies and plans has not been evaluated by the Chancellor's staff. Moreover, a June 1974 report from the Board of Governors indicated that only 50 percent of the existing plans considered student composition.

   Given the limited availability of data, it is impossible to evaluate the affirmative action policy at each Community College. However, there does seem to be considerable

variety in the degree of planning among the campuses toward the student affirmative action goals of ACR 151.

5. Chapter 1017, Statutes of 1975 (AB 2412 Meade), appropriated an additional $806,763 to the Board of Governors for Extended Opportunity Programs and Services.[6] The legislation states that these funds should be allocated "only to local programs which demonstrate their effectiveness and which have the most pressing need for financial aid for students." This legislation is important; not only does it increase the appropriation for EOPS, it also encourages the Board of Governors to develop methods for evaluating the effectiveness of local programs as well as for determining the financial need of students.

6. The only financial aid program at the Community Colleges that encourages recruitment of underrepresented groups is the Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS). In 1973-74, EOPS served 24,341 students with a total budget of $6,170,500. Given the added funds provided by Assemblyman Meade's legislation, the Community Colleges can be expected to serve an additional 3,000 students (assuming a per student expenditure of $248) during the next two years.

   A recent evaluation of EOPS indicates that the percentage of Spanish-surnamed students receiving financial aid has been decreasing--from 31 percent in 1971-72 to 28 percent in 1973-74.[7] This trend is not explained in the report, although this ethnic group is the most underrepresented in the Community Colleges. It should also be noted that there are no Chicana financial aid administrators in the Community College system. Given the existing underrepresentation of Spanish-surnamed women students in the Community Colleges, this lack should be addressed promptly, particularly in districts with large Spanish-speaking populations.

---

6. This appropriation is an augmentation of the $6,849,255 appropriated for EOPS by the Budget Act of 1975.

7. "EOPS Evaluation," Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, April 9-10, 1975, page 9.

V. CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

A review of the report submitted by the California State University and Colleges in response to ACR 151 reveals the following:

1. Compared to the general ethnic composition of recent California high school graduates, Asians and American Indians are adequately represented in the student body of the California State University and Colleges. Black and Spanish-surnamed students, however, are underrepresented. This underrepresentation is particularly acute with respect to Black men and Spanish-surnamed women in the graduate program. (See Table 2.)

2. There apparently has been a small decline in the proportion of ethnic minorities in the student body, when Fall 1974 enrollments are compared with those of Fall 1973.

3. While the report points out the serious underrepresentation of Spanish-surnamed students, particularly women in the graduate program, no plan to address this problem is presented. Two specific actions mentioned are special "open house" programs and the publication of a bilingual EOP bulletin.

4. The State University report indicates that an important factor affecting its ability to respond to the problem of underrepresentation is that the system is "highly dependent upon community college transfers in the efforts to increase minority and female enrollment." In Fall 1973, for example, 50 percent of all new undergraduates at CSUC were Community College transfers.

   This dependence clearly indicates the need for intersegmental cooperation to increase the access and retention of ethnic minority, women, and low-income students in public postsecondary education. The statewide plan for student affirmative action, to be presented in Part II of this report, will respond to this need.[8]

---

8. AB 2773, introduced by Assemblymen Fazio and Vasconcellos, would provide a method to address this problem by offering funds for the support of pilot projects "to increase the accessibility of postsecondary educational opportunities to low-income high school students and assist low-income community college students to continue in their studies." (Legislative Counsel's Digest, AB 2773, January 19, 1976.)

5. Specific programs to address the problem of under-representation in the State University include:

   a. Committee on Alternative Admissions

      The State University's report refers to a Committee on Alternative Admissions, which was established "to assess implications of results of existing special admissions programs and to guide the development and conduct of carefully designed admissions experiments." While the report states that results of the Committee's efforts "could improve accessibility of certain groups," the proposals considered thus far by the Committee (as of November 1, 1975) have not related to the issue of student affirmative action.

   b. Learning Assistance Centers

      At some campuses, Learning Assistance Centers have been established to help students overcome weaknesses in their educational preparation and thereby improve their chances for long-range academic success. The report provided insufficient information for an evaluation of this program.

   c. Educational Opportunity Program

      The Educational Opportunity Program was begun in 1965, with approximately 200 students. It is now a system-wide program with a current enrollment of approximately 18,000 students. This is the State University's major program for ethnic minority and low-income students and currently has an operating budget of $6,436,351.

   d. Financial Aid to Minority Students

      According to a report from the California State Scholarship and Loan Commission (now Student Aid Commission), a total of 30,867 scholarships, grants, loans, and employment positions was received by minority students at State University campuses in 1972-73. In 1973-74 this total increased to 31,047. In dollar value, this financial aid totaled $22,079,594 in 1972-73, and $23,026,016 in 1973-74. A significant change between 1972-73 and 1973-74 was the reduction in the number of scholarships and grants awarded in 1973-74 and an increase in the number of loans and employment positions.

Minority and low-income students are frequently less able and willing than middle-income students to accept the financial obligations of a loan; consequently, the reduction in the number of scholarships and loans hinders the response to underrepresentation at State University campuses.

VI. UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The University of California has made the most significant progress toward the development of a comprehensive plan for student affirmative action. A report from the Student Affirmative Action Task Groups describes the multiple problems and obstacles "to the access or success of women, members of minority groups, and economically or otherwise disadvantaged students," and proposes several recommendations to overcome them.[9] Many of these recommendations are now being translated into actions and programs.

The report of the University of California in response to ACR 151 shows that:

1. Compared to the general ethnic composition of recent California high school graduates, American Indians are adequately represented in the University's student body, while Asian students are substantially overrepresented. Black and Spanish-surnamed students are underrepresented, particularly the latter.

2. Women students are significantly underrepresented in the University's graduate programs.

3. There was no increase in the proportion of ethnic minorities in the Fall 1974 student body as compared with Fall 1973. The percentage of Black students actually decreased in Fall 1974 compared with Fall 1973 and Fall 1972. The percentage of Spanish-surnamed students in the Fall 1974 freshman class was smaller than that in Fall 1973 and Fall 1972.

4. Given the report's lack of data on the sexual composition of the various ethnic groups within the University's student body, no conclusions can be drawn as to the adequacy of female representation.

5. The University's response to ACR 151 stresses an important consideration. The University's entering freshman classes are drawn primarily from the upper 12-1/2 percent of California's high school graduates. Because the student affirmative action plan called for in ACR 151 is directed to entering freshmen, the University argues that it is faced with the "impossibility of achieving ethnic, economic, and sexual representation within each class, program, major, school, and discipline."

---

9. A report to the President of the University of California from the Student Affirmative Action Task Groups, July 1976, page 1.

The report also states that:

> . . .a plan aimed at elimination of sexual, ethnic, and economic underrepresentation by 1980 is unrealistic. . . . Nevertheless, the University is committed to overcoming those barriers to access which are within its ability to control and to providing leadership in influencing those factors not exclusively within its purview.

6. Chapter 1017, Statutes of 1975 (AB 2412 Meade), provides $1,100,000 from the State's General Fund for the University's Educational Opportunity Program and other outreach and support programs designed to increase the admission of disadvantaged students and to assist in their retention. This State support is to be matched by an equal contribution from the University. In addition, the University will continue its own support of EOP at the level of expenditure for the 1974-75 Fiscal Year.

   Using the funds provided by this legislation, the University is developing plans to address two problems: (1) A disproportionately low number of eligible nonwhite students enroll in the University. An expanded Out-Reach Program, with an additional $285,000 to be spent in 1975-76, will attempt to attract more of these students, and (2) An even smaller number of low-income students become eligible for admission to the University of California. An innovative Early Out-Reach Program, which is now being implemented will encourage junior high school students to plan their high school programs so that they will be eligible for admission to the University. $265,000 is to be expended on this program in 1975-76.[10]

---

10. For further information regarding this program see "Program Outline: A Partnership for Equal Opportunity," Office of the Vice President--University and Student Relations, University of California, January 1976.

7. The University's Educational Opportunity Program

Since 1965, the Regents have provided from their own funds a total $40 million for the University's Educational Opportunity Program. Participation in the program has risen from 100 students in 1965 to 7,980 in 1973 (9.3 percent of the University's 87,508 undergraduates). Until the recent passage of AB 2412, the University received no State support for its EOP programs.

The University report concludes that "clearly the existence of the Educational Opportunity Program has helped to broaden access to the University." The Regents' contributions over the past ten years have made this achievement possible. The provision of State funds will enable the University to expand this program during the next two years.

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

While progress has been made toward the goal of equal educational opportunity for all Californians, expanded efforts are needed if we are to overcome by 1980 the current ethnic, economic, and sexual underrepresentation of students in our public institutions. Several obstacles stand in the way of achieving this goal.

- Obstacle 1

  Lack of thoroughly developed, detailed student affirmative action plans

  The segmental responses to ACR 151 do not contain comprehensive plans for dealing with the problem of student underrepresentation. The University of California, as a result of the report of its Student Affirmative Action Task Groups, has developed an excellent basis for beginning the planning for a comprehensive student affirmative action plan.[11] The other two segments, which seem to be less organized in this regard, should consider adopting the UC Task Force approach. Without advanced detailed planning, there cannot be an effective program for responding to the problem of underrepresentation.

  Recommendation 1

  During the next six months the staffs of the Commission and the public segments should work to develop a comprehensive statewide plan for student affirmative action. This plan should: (1) define the problem of student underrepresentation in each of the segments; (2) establish short-term and long-range goals to be achieved at the segmental and statewide level; and (3) develop detailed programs to be followed in pursuit of those goals. Representatives of independent degree-granting institutions should be involved in this planning process.

  These integrated plans will be submitted to the Legislature in January 1977 for use in evaluating segmental and/or intersegmental requests for funding.

---

11. Portions of this report are presented in the appendix.

- Obstacle 2

Lack of personalized, well-coordinated student recruitment programs

Campus programs to recruit ethnic minorities and low-income students have emphasized such activities as participating in "college days" at high schools and Community Colleges, distributing bilingual literature to interested students and advisors, and conducting campus tours. While these methods are successful in attracting the traditional type of student, they do not respond to the unique needs and experiences of the underrepresented groups.

An effective affirmative action recruitment program must place greater emphasis on personal contact and encouragement and involve an expanded effort to urge prospective students not only to apply for admission, but, if accepted, to enroll.[12] An example of the innovative programs needed are those outreach programs being developed by the University's Santa Barbara campus, which will train Chicano student interns to recruit high school students and to develop personal contacts with Spanish-speaking families whose children express interest in the University.

Recommendation 2

In working with Commission staff on the statewide plan, the segments should consider methods to develop and expand innovative efforts to identify and contact prospective students from groups which are currently underrepresented in the ethnic, sexual, and economic composition of their student bodies. In order to limit the cost of these expanded efforts, the segments should consider the merits of cooperatively developing and implementing these outreach programs. This expanded and coordinated intersegmental program for student affirmative action should be included in Part II of this report.

---

12. There is evidence that some of the independent colleges have particularly successful personalized student recruitment programs. In preparing the statewide student affirmative action plan, this expertise should be utilized.

- Obstacle 3

Limited support services for women, minority, and low-income students

As increasing numbers of women, ethnic minority, low-income students gain access to California's public segments, expanded support services (e.g., remedial tutoring, personal counseling, and child care) are needed to enable these students to remain in college until they successfully complete their educational goals. The recent study by the University's Student Task Groups identified several important problems in regard to support services, including (1) "lack of meaningful sensitivity training for staff on the problems and concerns of minorities and women, (2) inadequate orientation to the array of student services available to new freshmen and transfer minority students, (3) lack of aggressive efforts to publicize special counseling and placement services among minority students, and (4) lack of advocacy for off-campus housing with respect to possible discrimination against minorities and women with children."[13]

Each of the segments needs to respond to problems of this type by developing expanded academic and nonacademic support programs particularly oriented to the needs of women, ethnic minority, and low-income students.

Recommendation 3

In working with Commission staff on the statewide plan, each segment should provide detailed information concerning their student support programs for women, ethnic minority, and low-income students.[14] Where expanded or innovative programs are needed, the segments should develop detailed program proposals and budget estimates. This information and these proposals should be included in Part II of this report.

---

13. A Report to the President of the University of California from the Student Affirmative Action Task Groups, July, 1975, pages 143-144.

14. These student assistance programs include academic counseling, personal and/or psychological counseling, career planning and placement, health services, student orientation, student housing, child care, recreation/athletic programs, and student grievance mechanisms.

- Obstacle 4

Lack of clear financial commitment from the State government

Many of the programs necessary for effective student affirmative action--such as expanded recruitment efforts, pre-college support programs, tutorial and counseling programs--require financial support. If the goal of ACR 151 is a high priority for the Legislature and the Governor, the requisite funds should be appropriated to enable our public institutions to achieve that goal. It is unproductive to request affirmative action plans from the segments without a clear commitment from the State to support the cost of those plans.

Recommendation 4

As a part of its involvement in the preparation of a statewide plan for student affirmative action, each public segment should develop a tentative budget of cost estimates for new activities. This material should be included in Part II of this report, which will be submitted to the Legislature in January 1977. The Legislature and Governor should then indicate the extent to which they will provide the financial support needed to achieve the goal of ACR 151. If the Legislature decides to fund the Commission's proposal for a pilot program of educational counseling centers, the segments should consider utilizing this program for expanded and innovative recruitment efforts.

- Obstacle 5

Lack of effective methods to evaluate segmental progress toward the goal of equal educational opportunity

In order to assess segmental progress in achieving their student affirmative action goals, it is necessary to have information which is comparable and consistent from year to year. The inconsistencies in data collection and reporting used during the past three years have made comparative analysis extremely difficult. Consequently, it is important for the segments to adopt a common format for reporting on the ethnic, sexual, and economic composition of their student bodies.

Recommendation 5

Beginning in January 1977, the segments should use a common format for reporting data. Appendix B contains a proposed "model" form for "Segmental Reporting on Student Affirmative Action." The Commission staff, in cooperation with segmental staffs, will refine the "model" and include it in Part II of this report, together with a statement of the cost of collecting and reporting the additional information. The Legislature should then indicate the extent to which it will support the costs of collecting data on student affirmative action programs.

In a letter commenting on an early draft of this report, Dean Robert Bess, California State University and Colleges, accurately stated, "We have reached a point that little more of real significance can be done to improve quality of educational opportunity except through cooperative effort. Thus, advice to the Legislature should express the view that what is needed is a single consolidated plan developed jointly by all segments of postsecondary education together with appropriate representation from the secondary schools . . . CPEC should provide the leadership for this effort."[15]

The task facing the Commission and the public segments in the coming months is to work together cooperatively in developing a statewide plan for student affirmative action. This plan will provide a means for making equal educational opportunity a reality in California postsecondary education.

---

15. Dean Robert Bess, in a letter to Dr. Bruce D. Hamlett, dated February 19, 1976.